

Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life. The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive—but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted to "protect the safety of the mother", when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure necessary to save a mother's life. You know full well the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society and 73 Democrats in the House if it did not. Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And, it is certainly inconsistent with other positions you have taken.

Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy reflected your deep concern for those who perished, especially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday for countless, equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you chose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceived are crucial for your re-election.

In the past three years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, of drugs and disease. You have pleaded with them to have respect for human life. But with this veto, you did the opposite. And we, as party officials, have been put in the untenable position of having to live with that decision.

Mr. President, I cannot and will not support this action. Therefore, I cannot in good conscience support your candidacy.

As I contemplated this matter over these past days, I was reminded of the words of the late President Kennedy when he said, "Sometimes party loyalty asks too much." Thus, it is with regret and sorrow that on this date, I have submitted my resignation as a member of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee and Chair of the Mexican-American Caucus. I have informed our State Chairman, Bill White. While I do not intend to actively support of vote for any Republican or Independent candidate. I will be asking other Democrats to consider withholding their support of your candidacy while continuing to support Democrats for other offices.

Very truly yours,

JOSE R. KENNARD,
State Committeeman, District 29.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TALENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed how many of my fellow colleagues here this afternoon had been speaking about the outrageous and repugnant veto of the legislation overwhelmingly passed in both Houses of the U.S. Congress regarding partial-birth execution-style abortion.

During the debate I tried to get pro-life Members on both sides of the aisle in the oldest party of America, the great Democratic Party, and the grand old party over here, I tried to get them all to use this expression execution-style because the attack to the child, and it is a child that is almost always viable, can survive outside the womb even if it is what we called disabled, that the attack is similar to the Cosa Nostra, or organized crime, attack, sometimes with a .22 pistol, to keep down the sound to the base of the skull. This is a common assault, whether it was with sword, ax, or during the Chinese revolution, Stalin's purges, or Hitler's henchmen.

For example, at the trench at Babyar in the Ukraine, or many of the labor camps with sick people, Japanese warlords directed soldiers executing our men and our Filipino allies on the Bataan death march 54 years ago.

This execution to the base of the skull, it was used in the Balkans all this last 4-year period of horrible ethnic cleansing and human rights violations, a bullet or a knife to the base of the skull.

And here in debate in one of these two houses was a woman, no less, an elected woman, talking about defend-

ing that this was important to the life of the mother. And somebody got up who served in this House honorably for 8 years, Senator BOB SMITH, and said, wait a minute, if it is for the life of the mother, why is the abortionist holding the baby in the birth canal? Why is he interrupting the birth process? This is conversely to what you are saying, endangering the mother's life. It is truly infanticide.

And I think that to let people know how unprecedented it is, as it says in a front-page story in the Washington Times, and I have not looked at the Post today and the New York Times to see whether they buried it, but it is a front-page story about all eight U.S. Catholic cardinals hitting Clinton on abortion, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and then read as much as I can of the bishop's letter and submit the rest, ask unanimous consent to submit the rest, for the RECORD, and I will return to the floor, as I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] will and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will many times on this.

This has got to rip apart Stephanopoulos' so-called Catholic plan to win the election in 202 days.

Mr. HUNTER. I do not want to take much time from my friend.

Mr. DORNAN. You are not taking it from me, but from eight cardinals; go ahead, though.

Mr. HUNTER. In that case, I feel better.

But let me just thank him, thank BOB DORNAN, for all the great work that he has done on behalf of unborn children and the fact that you are carrying this fight, as you have carried it for many, many years on the House floor, and I agree with you that the President has gone too far, that he stepped too far even for people who are able to look the other way on this issue in his party, and I hope that it is going to pull people off of this bandwagon that the President is putting together for his 1996 presidential campaign.

Mr. DORNAN. Well, you know our colleague, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, has been here. He is a classmate of yours, for 16 years almost, but he has this angelic face. I almost said he looked like an acolyte, and, therefore, he can stand where you are at this mike or down in the well and say tougher things than most of us can say.

He has been calling Clinton for 3½ years the abortion President. Nobody has ever jumped up and taken down his words, and I have refrained from doing that until this moment. But this shows, beyond all shadow of doubt, that Mr. Clinton is not a new Democrat, he is not a moderate Democrat, he is not even a run-of-the-mill liberal like many of our honorable friends on the other side of the aisle who are proud of their liberal philosophy, believe in a larger Federal Government than we do, basically to help the poor, to help children.